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Hello and Happy 2013 to everyone! It is truly an honor and privilege to serve NAKHE as its president this year. I have been a member of NAKHE since 1997 and have served in a variety of leadership roles within the organization. Now I have the ultimate privilege to serve as NAKHE president. I want to thank Jimmy Ishee and all the past presidents for their mentoring, advice and support throughout my career in higher education. I have learned quite a lot from my colleagues in this organization and look forward to continuing to serve NAKHE and its members in the same ways that the organization has served and supported me.

Two very important hallmarks about NAKHE are our commitment to fostering leadership development and networking opportunities for faculty, administrators and graduate students in higher education. I really hope you and your colleagues will join me and do what we can to bring these unique aspects of our association to life! One way to join in the spirit of NAKHE’s mission is to submit a proposal to present at the annual conference. Another way is by submitting your scholarly work for publication in this newsletter or for publication in *Quest*. You can learn more about NAKHE’s journal (mission, submission guidelines, etc.) by visiting [http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/uqst20/current](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/uqst20/current).

Speaking of the annual conference ... MARK YOUR CALENDARS NOW AND PLAN TO JOIN US IN SAN DIEGO IN JANUARY 2014! The dates for the 2014 NAKHE Conference are January 8 – 12, 2014. We will meet at the Bahia Resort Hotel in San Diego, CA! This will be a very important and historical conference related to issues and trends impacting Kinesiology in higher education. I encourage you to start making your plans now to attend and be a part of history. The 2014 NAKHE Conference will be a collaborative congress with delegates from AAHPERD, ACSM, AIESEP, AKA and NAK!! I encourage you to come and bring one or two colleagues with you! If you advise doctoral students, please encourage them to submit a proposal for the Joanna Davenport Doctoral Poster Award. If you or one of your colleagues is “new” to higher education, then please submit a proposal for the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award. There are plenty of conference slots available for other poster and oral presentations! You can always learn more about the conference by visiting [www.nakhe.org](http://www.nakhe.org).

On behalf of the NAKHE board of directors and ALL the wonderful people who volunteer their time to serve on the NAKHE committees, I want to thank you all again for your membership in and support of NAKHE. I am really looking forward to working with you all in bringing NAKHE’s mission to life and welcome any suggestions you may have about our organization.
Editor’s Note
Britton Johnson, Editor

Welcome back to the Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education. This is the first edition of the Chronicle that NAKHE has produced since October 2011. I am very excited about the future of the Chronicle and the changes that are being made.

I would like to start by thanking Shane Frehlich for his work as the previous editor. I am excited to take over and attempt to fill Shane’s shoes in this position. I would also like to commend the associate editors that worked with Shane in his time as editor. As the new editor, I am working to continue to produce a valuable publication that we can all be interested in reading, writing for, and using in our profession. With that in mind, I would like to introduce the changes to this journal.

First off, I am excited to begin to work with the previous associate editors (see the list of associate editors in the “Leadership Roster” section of the journal) as well as the new associate editors who will begin work on the next edition. I am also excited to work with Taylor and Francis, our new publisher for NAKHE journals, as well as our personal representative from Taylor and Francis, Shrikrishna Singh (or Krish as we all know him). NAKHE appreciates Krish’s hard work and will benefit greatly from his work and support.

The Chronicle will be published twice per year, with the possibility of a special edition from time to time. One change that is taking place is the renewed emphasis on peer reviewed sections of this journal. Those submitting manuscripts will be able to choose from peer reviewed or editor reviewed, as well as submitting in one of several new sections, which we hope will happen frequently. These sections, along with current sections, include Leadership in Higher Education, Current Issues, Best Practices in Teaching and Learning, Research Digest, New Kinesiology Professionals, International, Scholarly Publications, Public Affairs, Doctoral Student Submissions, Administration and Technology. Please submit any new manuscripts for possible publication in the Chronicle in any one of these sections.

I am thrilled to be the new editor of the Chronicle, and along with my associate editors, we are hopeful that we can publish quality manuscripts that are beneficial to members of NAKHE and the Kinesiology profession as a discipline. Please do not hesitate to contact me in order to submit a manuscript for possible publication (peer reviewed or editor reviewed) in the Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education.

bjohnson35@missouriwestern.edu
At the 2012 National Association for Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education (NAKPEHE) meeting in San Diego, CA, a vote by the membership changed the name of the organization to National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) and updated the mission of the organization. Where did these changes come from? The Future Directions Committee (FDC), at its meeting in June 2011, met and discussed a number of important items. The FDC believed that NAKPEHE at that point in time could choose to “stand pat” and let other organizations define the organization and what it did, or it could act to re-establish itself as the most influential interdisciplinary organization for leaders in kinesiology in higher education. NAKHE is unique from other organizations and it needed to let people in the field know this. The upcoming 2014 NAKHE Conference “STEPS into the Future” is in some ways an extension of these discussions. The name and mission change were recommended to the Board of Directors and, over the course of many conference calls, the mission was revised and submitted to the membership for approval—along with the updated name change. The mission statement now reads as follows:

The mission of NAKHE is to foster leadership in kinesiology administration and policy as it relates to teaching, scholarship and service in higher education.

This is not the first name, or mission change, for our organization. We are the offspring of the National College Physical Education Association for Men (NCPEAM) founded in 1897 and the National Association for the Physical Education of College Women (NAPECW) founded in 1923 (unofficially in 1910); two organizations that merged in 1979 as Physical Education departments across the country began to merge following shifts in higher education resulting from the passage of Title IX in 1972. The name of the new organization was to be National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education (NAPEHE)—as most college and university departments in our field were still utilizing the title of Physical Education for their department. However, in the 1990s a shift emerged and consensus began to grow around the name Kinesiology for our field.\textsuperscript{1} At our 2004 meeting in Clearwater, Florida it was decided to change the name of the organization to NAKPEHE, to reflect the shift that had occurred in our field. The mission was updated shortly thereafter. All of these name and mission changes, although they appear in the historical record as occurring at a single business meeting, are the result of months, and sometimes years of discussion among committees, the Board and the membership of the organization.

\textsuperscript{1}This certainly is not a finalized debate as there are MANY names for our departments across the country. However, leading organizations in the field like the American Kinesiology Academy (AKA), and the NAK have adopted Kinesiology for their name (NAK most recently went from the American Academy for Physical Education, to the American Academy for Kinesiology and Physical Education to the current National Academy of Kinesiology).
Leadership Development Workshop

Steve Estes
Middle Tennessee State University

On July 11–13, 2012, NAKHE ran its third Leader Development Workshop (LDW). Hosted once again by Georgia State University’s Department of Kinesiology and Health, this year’s workshop was attended by 19 new and continuing NAKHE members. The LDW mission is to provide opportunities for faculty interested in assuming leader roles in kinesiology to acquire management and leadership skills, and this year’s workshop was considered by those attending to be the best yet. Senior kinesiology leaders attending the LDW held positions ranging from program coordinator to associate provost; emerging leaders included three doctoral students (a new addition to the LDW) and six assistant professors. The goal of the LDW is to provide leader development for those interested in assuming leader roles, and NAKHE is pleased to note that the emerging leaders seem to enjoy and appreciate the opportunities provided in the program.

LDW programs are intensively conversational, and focus on specific topics suggested by experienced NAKHE administrators and leaders. The program format facilitates discussion. The first session is a Wednesday evening social, followed by morning and afternoon sessions on Thursday. A Friday morning session and a third topic are held, and a summary session wraps up the workshop. Workshop sessions are punctuated by breaks for coffee and sodas; all sessions are surrounded by socials that allow for significant interaction and mentoring. It was stated by several senior leaders that this LDW was the very best workshop they had ever attended! Emerging leaders were similarly pleased with the proceedings (see the article in this issue of The Chronicle by doctoral students Bruce Lund, Saori Ishikawa, and Joel Reece for their thoughts on the LDW). With no common measure of excellence among conferences, these evaluative comments should be understood as a recommendation to take a good look at future NAKHE LDWs if one is interested in moving into a leader role in kinesiology.

This year’s program began with a discussion led by Melanie Hart, Associate Dean at Texas Tech, on assessing distance education (DE). The conversation ranged from how to assess the DE proposal, to assessing the faculty teaching the course, to assessing learning outcomes in all DE. Political and personnel considerations informed the discussions, and models of best practice of how to deal with curricular and technical problems were shared.

The next session, led by Colonel Jesse Germain, PhD, Deputy Department Head of Physical Education at the United States Military Academy at West Point, focused on strategic planning. Perhaps no other organization does strategic planning better than the United States Army, and this session was imbued with that quality. Specific topics included discussions of the organization’s intent, the facilitator role in leading strategic planning, and how “followers” contribute to the discussions and implementation of the strategic plan. This “big picture” discussion of strategic planning was considered enormously helpful to those of us who have experienced the “death by PowerPoint” strategic planning presentation: being told what the organization is going to do without input from those of us who will do it. Germain’s discussion provided best practice solutions of how to get past this particularly knotty problem.

After lunch Dr. Tara Tietjen-Smith, Graduate Coordinator in the Department of Kinesiology at Texas A&M – Commerce, led a session that had a two-fold mission: first, a session for leaders on how to get a faculty to develop a viable mission statement; second, to pull from that mis-
Leadership Development Workshop, continued

ission statement the goals and objectives that inform the strategic plan. After some debate by the session organizers it was agreed that the one experience all of us have in common is NAKHE, so we tackled the NAKHE mission statement as an exercise in strategic planning (Editor’s Note: Following the LDW the NAKHE Future Directions Committee used this re-worked mission statement as a “direction statement,” and developed goals and directions for NAKHE that will be discussed at the Board meeting in October). The outcome was a re-worked mission statement:

NAKHE is devoted to promoting leadership through mentoring and networking among administrators, faculty, and students inclusive of disciplinary and institutional affiliation. Our diverse membership works together to create progressive partnerships, scholarly papers, and projects. We seek to foster continuity and focus as a premier voice for kinesiology.

Just for clarification and to let readers know that NAKHE has NOT changed its mission statement, the real Mission Statement (from our website at www.nakhe.org) reads as follows:

The mission of NAKHE is to foster leadership in kinesiology administration and policy as it relates to teaching, scholarship and service in higher education.

The outcome of the experience was that the participants learned a lot about how to run a session on strategic planning. And several of us like the developed mission statement as much as our real one! But the outcome we hoped to achieve was realized: after working with Jesse Germain and Tara Tietjen-Smith the participants felt confident and enthusiastic about participating in any effort that deals with strategic planning.

The final session was led by Damon Andrew, Dean of the College of Health and Human Services at Troy University. Andrew discussed “managing upward” in the context of his experience developing a “contested” program at Troy University, and after returning from a Harvard summer program, The Institute for Management and Leadership in Education (http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/index.html). The topic we discussed at the LDW focused on program approval, but the problems one must overcome as a program champion range from curriculum development, to internal departmental and campus politics, to dealing with balky legislators, to managing boards of regents. Not only did the participants come away with a sense of how to develop and get a big program approved; several of us began to inquire how one might participate in the Harvard summer program.

The LDW was, as indicated, a positive experience for all who attended. Most significantly, it was considered just the type of service that NAKHE does better than any other kinesiology organization. Faculty interested in participating in the 2013 LDW should contact Steve Estes at steven.estes@mtsu.edu. The 2013 LDW will be held once again at Georgia State from July 10–12. We hope to see you there!
In 2010, United States (US) President Barack Obama called for re-envisioning the government’s role in education through the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind law (US Department of Education, 2010). President Obama’s re-envisioning requires high quality teacher preparation in colleges and departments of education throughout the US. This means that teacher educators must ensure that teacher candidates are knowledgeable and skillfully prepared to effectively and justly work with children and youth who are culturally, economically, ethnically, and linguistically diverse. Important to this aim, our nation’s so-called minority-serving institutions of higher education are unique spaces for the preparation of physical education teachers who themselves come from richly diverse backgrounds.

Much has been written about physical education teacher education (PETE) programs at predominantly White institutions of higher education (Boyce & Rikard, 2001; Thomas & Reeve, 2006; Ward, Parker, Sutherland, & Sinclair, 2011), particularly at leading doctoral-granting institutions (see listing of top-ranked kinesiology/physical education programs; Thomas & Reeve, 2006). However, much less has been written about PETE programs at minority-serving institutions, which includes American Indian-serving colleges and universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The US Department of Education identifies minority-serving institutions using either one of two criteria: (a) legal status or (b) the percentage of ethnic minority student enrollment. This refers to students who are Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, or American Indian/Alaska Native (Li, 2007). The first criterion means that both Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) are defined by law. These institutions cannot grow in number unless the US Congress acts to designate additional institutions as HBCUs or TCUs (Li, 2007). The second criterion used is enrollment-based and is where institutions are defined as minority-serving institutions if they have a substantial enrollment proportion (typically at least 25%) of a specific minority group, but do not have legal status as an HBCU or TCU. In this commentary, we present illustrative profiles of these types of institutions with their rich histories. Further, we advance the possibility of recruiting undergraduates from minority-serving institutions into physical education graduate programs with the terminal goal of promoting a more diverse professorate in higher education.

Institutional Profiles

American Indian-Serving Institutions

American Indian-serving institutions were established in the US with a principal mission of educating American Indian students. American Indian-serving colleges and universities are defined as TCUs or institutions of higher education that are not HBCUs or TCUs, but where American Indian/Alaska Native students comprise at least 25% of the total undergraduate (UG) enrollment, while students in each of the other minority groups comprise less than 25% of the total UG enrollment (Li, 2007). American Indian or Alaska Native is defined by the U.S.
Census Bureau as “a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment” (Aud et al., 2011, p. 7). In 2004, there were 46 American Indian-serving institutions (Table 1), according to the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES; Li, 2007).

Further NCES data indicate that in fall 2004, American Indian-serving institutions had an enrollment of 50,635 UG students (Table 2). Of that total, 25,517 (50.4%) were American Indian/Alaska Native undergraduate students (Li, 2007).

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke is one such historic place. In 1887, the General Assembly of North Carolina (NC) on March 7 enacted legislation creating the Croatan Normal School in Robeson County, NC. The school opened with 15 students and one teacher in the fall of that year. Its mission was to prepare American Indian public school teachers. In 1909,

### Table 1. Number and Percentage Distribution of Degree-Granting Colleges and Universities, by Institutional Type and Population Served, Fall 1984, 1994, and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type and Population Served</th>
<th>Total Number of Institutions</th>
<th>% Distribution of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,060 3,299 3,935</td>
<td>100.0 100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority-serving</td>
<td>2,646 2,702 2,681</td>
<td>86.5 81.9 68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority-serving institutions (total)</td>
<td>414 597 1,254</td>
<td>13.5 18.1 31.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population served**
- HBCU: 96 99 94 (3.1 3.0 2.4)
- Black-serving, non-HBCU: 200 253 622 (6.5 7.7 15.8)
- Hispanic-serving: 58 125 366 (1.9 3.8 9.3)
- Asian-serving: 21 48 76 (0.7 1.5 1.9)
- American Indian-serving: 26 33 46 (0.8 1.0 1.2)
- Other minority-serving: 13 39 50 (0.4 1.2 1.3)

**Note.** Non-minority-serving institutions are usually predominantly White institutions.

**Source:** Adapted from Li (2007, p. 12).

### Table 2. Total UG Student Enrollment and Its Percentage Distribution, by Institutional Type and Population Served, Fall 1984, 1994, and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type and Population Served</th>
<th>Total UG Enrollment</th>
<th>% Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,612,108 12,234,979 14,780,630</td>
<td>100.0 100.0 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-minority-serving</td>
<td>9,450,734 9,851,291 10,253,664</td>
<td>89.1 80.5 69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority-serving (total)</td>
<td>1,161,374 2,383,688 4,526,966</td>
<td>10.9 19.5 30.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population served**
- HBCU: 201,898 248,135 269,896 (1.9 2.0 1.8)
- Black-serving, non-HBCU: 457,602 647,099 1,491,757 (4.3 5.3 10.1)
- Hispanic-serving: 289,807 749,267 1,928,447 (2.7 6.1 13.0)
- Asian-serving: 104,829 355,641 600,115 (1.0 2.9 4.1)
- American Indian-serving: 14,719 29,645 50,635 (0.1 0.2 0.3)
- Other minority-serving: 92,519 353,901 186,116 (0.9 2.9 1.3)

**Source:** Adapted from Li (2007, p. 14).
the school moved to its present location in Pembroke, which then was considered the center of the Indian community in that area. The school’s name was changed in 1911 to the Indian Normal School of Robeson County, and again in 1913 to the Cherokee Indian Normal School of Robeson County. In 1939, the school began offering a four-year college curriculum and in 1940 the first undergraduate college-level degrees were conferred. In 1941, the NC General Assembly changed the name of the school to Pembroke State College for Indians (PSCI). From that period until 1953, PSCI was the only state-supported four-year college for Indians in the nation. Further, the scope of the college was widened in 1942 when non-teaching baccalaureate degrees were added; and in 1945 when enrollment, previously limited to the American Indians of Robeson County, was opened to people from all federally-recognized Indian groups. In 1949, the NC General Assembly shortened the name to Pembroke State College (PSC).

In 1953, the Board of Trustees approved the admission of White students up to 40% of the college’s total enrollment. In 1954, after the US Supreme Court’s decision in the Brown et al. v. Board of Education case favoring school desegregation, PSC Board of Trustees opened the college to all qualified applicants without regard to race. The college enrollment expanded by over 500% during the next eight years. In 1969, the General Assembly changed the name again to Pembroke State University (PSU), and made it a regional university. In 1972, the General Assembly established the 17-campus University of North Carolina (UNC) system with PSU as one of the constituent institutions. On July 1, 1996, PSU officially became The University of North Carolina at Pembroke (UNCP). Nearly a decade later (July 5, 2005), NC Governor Mike Easley signed into law Session Law 2005-153, House Bill 371 declaring UNCP a historically American Indian university. The preceding historical accounts were extracted from the UNCP’s (n.d.) Web site at http://www.uncp.edu/uncp/about/history.htm.

Nationally most (63%) US college students in fall 2008 were White, 14% were Black, 12% were Hispanic, 7% were Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 3% were international undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students (Aud et al., 2010). Even with their small proportion of the overall student population, “about 8 percent of American Indian/Alaska Native students attended colleges where their racial/ethnic group made up 75 percent or more of the total enrollment” (Aud et al., 2010, p. 116). Most of these were Tribal Colleges and Universities.

**Tribal Colleges and Universities**

Liken to American Indian-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs) are institutions in which American Indian/Alaska Native students constitute 25% or more of the total undergraduate enrollment (Li, 2007). Moreover, TCUs are usually tribally controlled, located on reservations, and affiliated with the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (Aud et al., 2010). This Consortium, that is the AIHEC, was founded in 1972 and initially it consisted of six TCUs. Today, there are more than 30 TCUs with regular membership and 3 with associate membership in the US, and one Canadian tribal college with international membership affiliation in AIHEC (2011).

TCUs are also designated by law. They include institutions cited in Section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994, any other institution that qualifies for funding under the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, and Diné College, authorized in the Navajo Community College Assistance Act of 1978. Most of these institutions are chartered by tribes themselves and serve American Indian students on reservations, although a few have been chartered by the federal government to serve American Indian populations. (Li, 2007, p. iv)

According to AIHEC, these institutions were founded in response to the higher education needs of American Indian citizens who were geographically isolated—especially those living on
reservations—with limited access to more traditional mainstream colleges and universities. In fall 2007, TCUs had a total enrollment of 17,418 students. Of that total, 13,820 (79.3%) were American Indian/Alaska Native students (Snyder & Dillow, 2010).

Most TCUs are community colleges with no PETE programs. However, Stone Child Colleges, which is a Tribal College, has a Teacher Education program, designed to (a) meet the needs of students in pursuit of an associate degree as a para-educator; and (b) provide an initial education experience that will transfer to a baccalaureate degree in Health and Physical Education (Stone Child College, 2011). Important also, some TCUs award associate degrees in related areas, particularly in health. For example, an associate degree of applied science is offered at Blackfeet Community College (BCC) in Health and Physical Fitness. The college, which is located in Browning (Montana), provides higher education opportunities to the Blackfeet Indian Reservation community (BCC, 2009). Similarly, Diné College in Tsaile, Arizona (Navajo Nation) offers an associate degree in Public Health with curricular options in Health Education, Environmental Public Health, and Health Occupation (Diné College, 2011).

Hispanic-Serving Institutions

The Office for Civil Rights, under Public Law 103-208, defines Hispanic-serving institutions as degree-granting colleges and universities with a full-time-equivalent UG enrollment of 25% or more Hispanic students, and at least 50% of the Hispanic students have family incomes at or below 150% of the poverty level as identified by the U.S. Census Bureau (Snyder & Dillow, 2010, 2011). In this commentary, we use the term Hispanic for consistency with the U.S. Department of Education the source of most data reported in the article. Arguably, however, the terms Latina and Latino are more inclusive and politically progressive (Delgado et al., 2007). In the continental US, Hispanic-serving institutions are concentrated mostly in the Western (42%) and Southwest (33%) states, which reflects the high concentration (60%) of the general Hispanic population in these two regions (Li, 2007).

In fall 2004, there were 1,928,447 UG students enrolled at 366 Hispanic-serving colleges and universities, according to data from the NCES (Li, 2007). Most Hispanic-serving colleges and universities are members of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (de los Santos & Vega, 2008). The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities was founded in 1986 with 18 member institutions and today represents nearly 450 institutions committed to the success of Hispanic persons in education (http://www.hacu.net/hacu/Default_EN.asp).

The University of Puerto Rico (UPR) at Bayamón and the University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez are Hispanic-serving institutions. These comprehensive public universities have the distinct mission of providing leadership to improve the quality of life for the people of Puerto Rico and the Caribbean region. That is to say, these universities are vital to the education of persons residing in Puerto Rico and beyond. Both the UPR at Bayamón and the UPR at Mayagüez are land grant, co-educational metropolitan universities comprised of a large proportion of bilingual (English and Spanish-speaking) faculty, staff and students. These universities have strong teacher education programs and maintain close working partnerships with area public rural and urban schools. The UPR at Bayamón offers bachelor’s degrees in its Elementary and Adapted Physical Education (APE) program leading to teacher certification. In fact, UPR at Bayamón is the only institution in Puerto Rico to provide an UG major in APE leading to teacher certification. Likewise, the UPR at Mayagüez is committed to developing educated, cultured citizens, capable of critical thinking, and contributing meaningfully to the society at-large. The UPR at Mayagüez offers both undergraduate and graduate level physical education degrees. Prospective teacher candidates may enroll in the Teacher Preparation Program either after completing a bachelor’s program or while pursuing a bachelor’s degree in the Department of Physical Education at the UPR at Mayagüez. They can obtain a teaching license in APE subsequent to receiving a secondary physical education teaching license.

(continued)
Historically Black Colleges and Universities

The Higher Education Act of 1965 defines historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) as institutions of higher education established before 1964 whose principal mission was then, and largely remains today, the education of Black Americans (Wilson, 2008). HBCUs have long provided hallowed grounds for academic preparation of Black and other students.

On August 30, 1890, the US Congress passed the 2nd Morrill Act, which required states with segregated systems of higher education to provide land-grant institutes for both all-White and colored systems (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). This act led to the establishment of land-grant HBCUs for the teaching of the agricultural and mechanical arts to Black citizens (Craig, 1992; Wallenstein, 1992). These institutions have expanded in number, student enrollments, curricular offerings, and programs over the years. In fall 2004, there were 269,896 UG students at 94 HBCUs, according to the NCES (Li, 2007). Hodge, Bennett III, and Collins (in-press) reported that there were an estimated 310,446 students enrolled at 103 accredited HBCUs across 21 states, the District of Columbia, and the US Virgin Islands in fall 2006. Today most HBCUs are 4-year liberal arts colleges and universities. Two examples are Fayetteville State University and Hampton University. These HBCUs are located in the South region of the US.

Fayetteville State University (FSU) is a public comprehensive regional university and constituent member of the University of North Carolina (UNC) system. In 1867, seven pioneers: Matthew N. Leary, Andrew J. Chesnutt, Robert Simmons, George Grainger, Thomas Lomax, Nelson Carter, and David A. Bryant acquired two lots of land on Gillespie Street in Fayetteville, North Carolina (NC) and established themselves as a Board of Trustees in the founding of a school for the education of Black students. By a legislative act in 1877, the NC General Assembly provided for the establishment of a Normal School for the education of Black teachers. Over the years, the institution has expanded in size, facilities, programs, and curricular offerings. Under the presidency of Dr. J. Ward Seabrook the school was named Fayetteville State Teachers College, thereafter being authorized to grant Bachelor's degrees in Education. The college received both state and regional accreditation in 1947. In 1957, Dr. Seabrook retired and was succeeded by Dr. Rudolph Jones. Under Dr. Jones’ administration, the curriculum was expanded to include majors in secondary education and programs leading to degrees outside the teaching profession. In 1963, the College was renamed Fayetteville State College. In 1969, the institution acquired its present name, Fayetteville State University, and Dr. Charles A. Lyons, Jr. was elected president (and later became its first Chancellor). By a legislative act in 1972, FSU became a constituent institution of The UNC System. The preceding historical accounts were taken from FSU’s (2011) web site at: http://library.uncf-su.edu/Archives/HistoryFSU.htm.

Today, FSU offers bachelor’s degrees in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Human Services leading to physical education and health certification. Historically speaking, however, no undergraduate PETE programs existed for African Americans until 1924 when Howard and Hampton universities established such programs (Hodge & Wiggins, 2010).

In 1868, Samuel Armstrong, Superintendent of the Freedmen’s Bureau of the 9th District of Virginia, opened Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Now more than 140 years after its inception, Hampton University stands proudly as a private co-educational HBCU in Hampton, Virginia. Initially Hampton began preparing African American/Black educators in the face of widespread racism in the US, which forbid them admission into predominantly White colleges and universities (Hodge & Wiggins, 2010). Hampton continues its commitment to educating African American/Black citizens. To that mission, the university’s PETE program prepares teacher candidates to become highly qualified, effective and culturally responsive educators.
Advisory, Recruitment and Diversity

In addition to presenting illustrative profiles of minority-serving institutions in this commentary, we advance the possibility of recruiting undergraduates from these historic institutions into physical education graduate programs with the terminal goal being a more diverse professorate in higher education. We believe that minority-serving colleges and universities are fertile grounds for the recruitment of ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students to enter into graduate programs at leading doctoral-granting colleges and universities (Hodge & Wiggins, 2010). In fall 2007, for example, there were an estimated 303,006 students enrolled at HBCUs; another 2,231,691 students at Hispanic-serving institutions; and 17,418 students enrolled at TCUs (Ryu, 2010). Stated differently, there was a combined total of more than 2.5 million students with a high proportion of those students from ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The low presence of African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Hispanic students in PETE programs combined with other salient factors (e.g., high rates of attrition, standardized testing), contributes to a limited pool of persons of color available for recruiting and hiring as faculty at leading doctoral-granting colleges and universities (Hodge, Faison-Hodge, & Burden, 2004; Hodge & Wiggins, 2010; King, 1994). On this issue, Professor Jerry R. Thomas (2003) asserted that,

The fact that we have difficulty attracting faculty of color to our institutions is a direct result of our failure to attract students of color to our doctoral programs. I believe our over emphasis on quantitative values to select doctoral students is a direct influence in this problem. We admit students to programs based on a quantitative notion of smart and fail to look carefully at the other characteristics implied by SWAN—hard working, adaptable, and nice. Of course, it is much easier to rely on a GPA and GRE test score than to evaluate the other SWAN characteristics and the notion of social quotient. If we ever hope to achieve a diverse faculty in higher education that represents the world’s cultures, we must begin by achieving a diverse group of doctoral students. (p. 8)

To reiterate, PETE programs at leading doctoral-granting colleges and universities should develop strategic plans with the goal of recruiting greater numbers of ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students into their graduate programs (Hodge & Wiggins, 2010).

The importance of minority-serving institutions to that goal should not be undervalued, or underestimated. These institutions include two- and four-year liberal arts and community colleges, as well as various business schools, law, medical, theological, and technical institutions. They are educational, social, and cultural landscapes for students of color. Important also, many American Indian-serving institutions, Hispanic-serving institutions, and HBCUs have established PETE programs readily available to the recruitment, retention and preparation of a diverse teacher workforce in physical education.

Notes

1. Black-serving, non-HBCU are institutions of higher education that are not HBCUs/TCUs, but in which Black students comprise at least 25% of the total undergraduate enrollment, while students of all other individual minority groups each comprise less than 25% of the total undergraduate enrollment (Li, 2007, p. v).

2. Asian-serving are institutions of higher education that are not HBCUs/TCUs, but in which Asian/Pacific Islander students comprise at least 25% of the total undergraduate enrollment, while students of all other individual minority groups each comprise less than 25% of the total undergraduate enrollment (Li, 2007, p. v).

3. Other minority-serving are institutions of higher education that do not fit any of the preceding institutional categories (i.e., American Indian serving; Asian-serving; HBCUs; Black-serving, non-HBCU; Hispanic-serving; or TCUs), but in which minority students as a whole comprise at least 50% of the total undergraduate enrollment (Li, 2007, p. v).

4. Thomas (2003) explained that in the broader workforce employers seek to hire persons they consider to be SWANs meaning Smart, Hard Working, Adaptable, and Nice.
Minority-Serving Institutions, continued
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Best Practices in Teaching and Learning

Increasing Active Participation Lectures Using Student Response Systems

Erik Rabinowitz, Robert McKethan and Michael Kernodle
Appalachian State University

Introduction

Teachers today face a plethora of problems such as attendance, in-class engagement and lack of attention just to name a few. In addition, the traditional lecture method of teaching is under fire. Limitations of the lecture-only approach typically center on concerns with the attention span of students, as well as the retention of disseminated information. Researchers often differ regarding students’ attention span capabilities in lectures (Matheson, 2008). How-

Figure 1. Base station, controller and software interface.
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ever, it is commonly reported that students’ attention span in lectures varies between 10 and 15 minutes (Bligh, 1972; Wilson & Korn, 2007) and students themselves report that the longest time they can comfortably endure uninterrupted lecture is 20–30 minutes (MacManaway, 1970). A possibly significant factor related to attention span is that by the age of 21, the current generation has spent on the average of 10,000 hours playing video games, 200,000 hours on e-mail, 20,000 hours watching TV, 10,000 hours on cell phones, and under 5,000 hours reading (Bonamici et al., 2005; Carlson, 2005). An interesting new study (Lillard & Peterson, 2012) indicates that fast paced cartoons like, “SpongeBob Square Pants,” can negatively affect a 4-year-old’s focus and memory – and it only takes less than 10 minutes of tube time. While this information maybe disconcerting to most readers, a potential consequence of the ‘connected age’ is a shorter attention span resulting in the need for higher levels of novelty to gain their attention. As such teachers may have to find unique ways to connect to this generation.

Enabling 21st century learning outcomes requires this effective utilization of technology as well as collaboration and the modeling of reflective skills. One way of addressing these problems is for instructors to begin to use both sophisticated and simple technologies to change to a more student-involved and active teaching learning environment. One approach might be to use Student Response Systems (SRS).

About Student Response Systems (SRS)

Student Response Systems are also called classroom response systems, audience response systems, or personal response systems. The function of SRS allows interactive engagement between instructors and students during a lecture. The traditional system utilizes a base station and controller on the teacher side and signaling devices used by students to transmit a choice, vote or answer to the base station (see Figure 1). The base station and software allows for student responses to be projected over applications (e.g., PowerPoint) that students see on the screen (see Figure 2). Student responses are shown in ‘real time’ and, at the conclusion of the voting, allows for interactive dialogue.

(continued)
Benefits of SRS

One of the most useful benefits for instructors can be in the ability to save time. For instance, taking attendance can be extremely difficult and time consuming, especially when class sizes are large. SRS devices facilitate taking attendance and can hold students more accountable to attending class. Studies even show that, when linked to grades, SRS can increase attendance (Caldwell, 2007). In addition, most of the SRS have device grading/scoring capabilities for quizzes that provide not only individual responses/scores, but whole class responses. A few systems even allow students to move at their own pace, such as on a printed test, to record their responses.

SRS systems also encourage individual and class engagement via a novel technological approach. The systems allow anonymous polling of the students which frequently results in participation by students who would otherwise not do so (Graham, Tripp, Seawright & Joekel, 2007). Moreover, students can compare their answers to others in the class which may stimulate discussions as to why answers were correct or incorrect. In addition, instructors are provided feedback about student knowledge of the subject under discussion. Beyond the immediate in-class effects, much of the research suggests that SRS generally enhances student outcomes such as improved exam scores and passing rates, student comprehension and learning, and that they enjoy using these systems (Roschelle et al., 2004; Duncan, 2005; Simpson & Oliver, 2007).

SRS Use by Instructors

There are many different types of practices instructors have employed in their classrooms with SRS. For example, many SRS systems will allow for students to record homework assignments outside of class and have students submit their responses at the beginning of class. Some instructors have used these systems to “warm up” class discussions and to incorporate peer instruction allowing those with correct answers to interact with those who missed the questions (Mazur, 1997). Instructors looking for fun and innovative ways to conduct reviews have combined game show components such as Jeopardy and Who Wants to be a Millionaire with the SRS. Instructors using SRS on a regular basis are afforded the opportunity to pull all the content-specific questions used throughout a unit and assess students’ knowledge prior to an exam. Instructors have also used these systems to: share opinion-type questions where students can rate their confidence in a prior question’s response (some SRS’s allow for immediate confidence ratings on a response); gauge students’ progress on a paper; recall facts and content; test conceptual-understanding; test for application skills using scenarios; assess critical thinking such as “choose the best answer amongst an array of answers”; and assess syllabus understanding (Bruff, 2011).

In addition to use in the classroom, instructors have even started using SRS systems for research data collection. For example, if a research study has numerous subjects at once completing a survey these systems could collect multiple responses simultaneously. Also, qualitative researchers have used these systems in Delphi and Q methods to create consensus. Basically, the application of these systems may only be the tip of the iceberg at this point.

Caveats with SRS

As with any new technology, a few problems have been reported, which may cause some instructors to not want to invest in these systems. Student response systems can be difficult to use at first and require some preparation time beyond just writing effective questions. For example, set up of the equipment could take time needed for other areas of preparation. Technical problems can occur, causing confusion, loss of class time, frustration and outright rejection.

(continued)
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of the SRS. Students also have a learning curve and for some it can be steep (Bruff, 2011; Kay & LeSage, 2009).

If you are interested in trying a system there are numerous companies that have SRS type systems. Some of the more prominent are: I Clicker, Turning Point, Quizdom, Classtalk and H-ITT. A more recent development allows students to use internet applications such as Poll Everywhere in coordination with their smartphone or cell phone to text responses that can be used in a fashion similar to other SRS. Student responses are texted to a number (e.g., Yes = 4536; No = 4537). Most web-based SRS have feature-centered plans, usually starting with a free plan with few enhancements beyond a display of responses. Like the traditional SRS, web SRS polling responses are almost instantaneous. The drawback to SRS devices requiring the use of student phones includes the cost of texting (a problem if students do not have unlimited texting plans), and the use of phones in an SRS environment may add an additional distraction to students.
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Every sport fan has a favorite team and would love nothing more than to be able to watch and enjoy the game in a brand new state-of-the-art stadium built in their city. However, this new cutting-edge stadium that they want built does not come without a cost. Historically, almost all sports were played in privately owned venues (Swindell & Rosentraub, 1998). After the 1950s, public funding for the building of new stadiums and arenas became more common in order for cities to attract popular sport teams to relocate to their city (Weiner, 2004). While public funding was still new, teams and other users, such as concerts and circuses, would pay a rental cost that would help make up for operating fees and the public funding (Swindell & Rosentraub, 1998). According to Weiner (2004), today governmental units provide subsidies for the building of stadiums including: 1) publicly financing stadiums and renovations, 2) offering favorable leases, 3) offering direct cash payment, and 4) using tax-exempt bonds to finance construction. However, the primary question of concern to be addressed in the present article is: Will a city financing the construction of a new stadium for a professional team really benefit from the taxpayer dollars that go into it?

Cities around the country have questioned whether or not a professional sport team with a new stadium or arena will benefit the city. Several studies (Crompton, 2004; Rascher & Rascher, 2004; Swindell & Rosentraub, 1998) have explored the financial economic impact, as well as the tangible benefits, that a new venue built for a professional team will bring to a city. Some studies are in favor of publicly funded facilities (Mondello, 2003; Weiner, 2004) and others are against idea (Baade, 1996; Swindell & Rosentraub, 1998). We believe the idea is sound; a new stadium and the presence of a professional team eventually have a lot to offer the right city. The purpose of this paper is to focus on the positive outlook for a city to finance a new stadium or arena for a professional team. This will be done by looking at: 1) why cities should want to finance new facilities, 2) what type of cities should look into it, 3) what cities get in return for it, and 4) a successful example of a new stadium or arena as well as an unsuccessful example.

Why Finance a Stadium?

There are many positive reasons why a city should want to finance the building of a new stadium or arena for a professional team in their city. Three reasons we focus on are city visibility, increased city development, and community outreach. When a team first moves into a new city, media coverage is everywhere throughout that city talking about “the big move.” The media doesn’t leave once the team settles in. The media digs their feet in and covers every game played, which in turn provides exposure to that city. For example, Jacksonville, Florida’s NFL team the Jacksonville Jaguars will broadcast their games in the dead of winter to cities such as Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Baltimore. Fans watching from those colder climate cities will see the warm and welcoming Florida sun on television and in turn possibly increase tourism in Florida (Crompton, 2004).

Building a new stadium or arena in a city presents it with the opportunity of development. Crompton (2004) believed that a stadium cannot be built as an island surrounded by concrete
parking lots. Rather, the city should design development plans around the creation of the stadium. Fans come to the area on game days and have a great time, spend money, stay in hotels, eat at restaurants and so on. When there are no games planned for a particular day, there should still be something in the area attracting those same fans to come even where there isn’t a game being played that day. This is also known as sport tourism. Businesses will notice this demand, not only on game days, and begin locating their places of business closer to the stadium or arena.

Another important aspect a professional team can bring to a city is community outreach. Almost every professional league has some sort of community involvement program, such as NFL Charities, NBA Cares, and MLB in the Community. NFL Charities, for example, has granted more than $120 million to over 640 different organizations. Many of those grants focus on developing community activities for youth in each team’s specific local market ([www.nflcharities.org](http://www.nflcharities.org)). NBA Cares has been around since 2005 and has raised more than $145 million for charity, provided 1.4 million hours of hands-on service, and built over 500 places where kids can live, learn, or play ([www.nbacares.com](http://www.nbacares.com)). For example, the Memphis Grizzlies partnered with St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, which specialized in research toward childhood cancer, and helped them to build the Memphis Grizzlies House which provides free short-term housing to over 100 families a night on the campus of St. Jude ([www.st.jude.org](http://www.st.jude.org)). A professional team in a city, therefore, can contribute positively to the particular city’s environment and community. For the reasons cited above, there are positive attributes that a new stadium or arena for a professional team can bring to a city that outweigh the price the city pays for the stadium.

**What Type of City?**

When teams are looking to relocate, people often believe it is to get into a bigger city with more fans. This is not always the case. Rascher and Rascher (2004) stated, “the choice of a city depends on at least three major factors: the owner’s personal preference, the political climate, and the economics of the location” (p. 275). Another key criterion of a city that is looking to build a new stadium or arena for a professional team is population. When a team comes into a city, the more fans they can attract turns into more franchise money. With more franchise money come better players, which in turn provides greater opportunity to field a better team. A better team attracts even more fans that lead to even more money for the franchise (Figure 1).

Currently, two U.S. cities sit in the top ten list of megacities in the world; New York City is ranked number six with 8,391,881* residents, and Los Angeles is number eight with 3,831,868* residents. New York City, for example, has nine professional teams alone including one Women’s National Basketball Association (WNBA) team, NY Liberty, two National Basketball Association (NBA) teams, NY Knicks and Brooklyn Nets, two National Football League (NFL) teams, NY Giants and NY Jets, two National Hockey League (NHL) teams, NY Islanders and NY Rangers, and two Major League Baseball (MLB) teams, NY Mets and NY Yankees. The population in these megacities is able to support each team the way they need to be supported and in some cases they create the richest teams in their respective leagues.

Large cities with a population under one million residents can sufficiently support several different professional teams. For instance, Detroit, Michigan has a population of 910,921*. The city has an Arena Football League (AFL) team, the Fury, the NFL Lions, NBA Pistons, NHL Red Wings, WNBA Shock, and MLB Tigers. However, not all large cities have one team in every league. Memphis, Tennessee with a population of approximately six hundred thousand only has one professional team in the NBA Grizzlies. The owners of the team must feel that their

*Population from [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov) on April 11, 2011.

(continued)
team is getting a good environment with quality fans and a great deal on the stadium before moving forward into a city.

One example of a city with population barely pushing over one hundred thousand that supports a successful professional team can be found in Green Bay, Wisconsin (population 101,412*). Even though Green Bay is a comparatively small city, they can produce and support a Super Bowl winning NFL team in the Packers. This team will more than likely never leave the city of Green Bay due to the history of the team and the unique way the city supports the team. However, it is equally likely that no team will ever intentionally move to a city that small and attempt to replicate Green Bay’s success. The size and population of a city are important factors that teams must look at before deciding to move.

What Does a City Get in Return?

Bringing a professional team to a city with a new stadium or arena can help a city do many things, both physically and civically. Three examples of this are transforming their downtown core (or other location of the stadium) into a livable area, creating jobs, and generating civic pride in the citizens of the city. First, a new stadium can change an outdated and unappealing downtown area of a city into an attractive and popular area. As Weiner (2004) explained, “by making the downtown area ‘livable,’ sports stadiums can help to hold together a coalition of private businesses, charities, and public sector entities committed to the downtown area by providing a common factor for all to rally around” (p.55). The new stadium will give city residents and travelers an enticing reason to visit that particular area of downtown either for the game or event itself or just to visit the new state of the art facility. Cleveland and Indianapolis were both able to revamp their downtown areas by building new professional arena and stadiums for their existing professional teams (i.e., the Cleveland Indians and the Indianapolis Colts).

Second, development of a new arena or stadium will also create more jobs in the city (Swindell & Rosentraub, 1998). With the new large-size facility, there will be more demand for jobs within the new stadium or arena itself, and in the area immediately surrounding the stadium or arena. Basically, hotels will be needed to accommodate travelers, restaurants will be needed for visitors to the stadium, and people will be needed to staff the events and maintain the facility. When Cleveland built two new venues, Jacobs Field and Gund Arena, during its Gateway project it created 1300 new jobs in just two years (Swindell & Rosentraub 1998). Swindell and Rosentraub (1998) also explained that it cost over two hundred thousand dollars per job by taking the cost of the stadium and dividing it by the number of jobs. The cost of the stadium, however, should not solely be related to just the creation of new jobs because the stadium’s benefits are larger than just new jobs.

Third, civic pride is created in a city by introducing a professional sport team to it. The professional team provides the city with a valuable product that everyone in the city can relate to and be proud of. Crompton (2004) affirmed, “sports teams provide a tangible focus for building community consciousness and social bonding … they are one of the few vehicles available for developing a sense of community” (p. 49). In this day and age it is important for residents of a city to feel like part of a community where they can bond with others and not have to fear everyone. Whenever a person sees other residents wearing the jersey, t-shirt, or hat of their favorite team it is believed that they will automatically feel a bond with that person because they both enjoy the same home-team. Without a stadium or arena, there would not be a professional team in that city. Cities, therefore, derive both physical and civic benefits whenever they bring a new professional team to the city with a new stadium or arena.

Successful and Unsuccessful Examples

There are many examples of professional teams moving into a new stadium with successful results. There are also a few examples of unsuccessful moves. Howard and Crompton (2003) reported that professional teams who moved to new locations over a three-year period showed average attendance increases. For instance, the MLB saw a 66% increase. The NFL saw a 26% increase. Finally, the NBA was at a 4% increase (Howard & Crompton, 2003).

A particular example of a successful relocation in the NBA would be the moving of the Grizzlies franchise from Vancouver, British Columbia in Canada to Memphis, Tennessee in 2001. A new publicly funded arena was built in Memphis, the FedExForum, with a capacity of 18,119 for basketball, and opened in 2004, which cost $250 million to build. After ten years of being in Memphis, the Grizzlies were the subject of a study performed by Younger Associates, a Jackson, Tennessee based market research and advertising firm, and by the president and CEO of the Greater Memphis Chamber, John Moore (Morgan, 2010). In this study, the author showed that the Grizzlies and FedExForum generated an annual economic impact of $233 million, with $207 million coming from team and arena operations and the other $26 million coming from visiting team and spectator spending (such as retail and lodging). Crompton (2004) defined economic impact as “the net economic change in a host community that results from spending attributed to the sport facility” (p. 42). It also created 1,374 full-time-equivalent jobs (Morgan, 2010). In particular, Morgan (2010) noted that 35% of the arena patrons came from outside the county in which the city of Memphis is located (40% for non-basketball events), and they spent an average of $23.40 outside of the arena. The taxes generated from the FedExForum are also substantial at a cost of $5.3 million annually (Morgan, 2010). The Memphis Grizzlies would be an example of a successful relocation for a NBA team because of the high economic impact of the team and arena, the amount of patrons who come from outside of the county, the full-time equivalent jobs that have been created, and the local tax revenues generated by the arena.
On the other hand, an example of an unsuccessful relocation and new stadium for a professional team would be the move the Montreal Expos made out of Montreal, Quebec in Canada to Washington D.C. in the United States. In 2005 they changed their name to the Washington Nationals and played their first three years in R.F.K. stadium (a multi-purpose stadium that built in 1961) until their new stadium, Nationals Park, was built in 2008. Nationals Park was built using publicly financed funds at a cost of $611 million (Passan, 2010). The new ballpark was built in an area call the Anacostia waterfront and its purpose was to revitalize the surrounding area. This has yet to happen in the three years it has been around, leaving empty real estate and no attractions to the area besides the baseball park and the team (Passan, 2010). Nationals Park has a capacity of 41,222 and an average attendance of only 24,772 in the past three seasons, 2008–2010 (www.baseball-almanac.com). Out of the 16 teams in the National League, the Nationals have yet to rank higher than 14th in their attendance rankings based on the Street & Smith’s Sport Business Journal (issued on June 6–12, 2011). There has been hardly any economic return on the new stadium but experts in the area remain optimistic saying that it takes a long time to completely revitalize an area like the Anacostia waterfront (Somers, 2011). So far, the Montreal Expos change to the Washington Nationals has not paid off for the Washington D.C. area, and the publically-funded Nationals Park has not yet delivered tangible economic benefits to the city. Both the Vancouver Grizzlies and the Montreal Expos took a chance in changing locations with a new stadium. One is a success story that looks like it can only get better and the other is showing signs of becoming a very unsuccessful move.

While researching stadiums, it was a lot harder to find an unsuccessful example than it was finding a successful example. Even the unsuccessful example is still new and has time to improve. If the Washington Nationals were to have planned their location better it might be a different story right now. However their future plans include developing the area with condominiums, shopping centers, and bars and restaurants. It could very possibly be that in several years this unsuccessful example becomes a successful example.

Conclusion
It makes perfect sense for a city with available space and a big enough population to try their best to bring in a professional sport team and provide them with a new, state of the art arena or stadium. It reminds the authors of the old saying, “it takes money to make money.” In this situation, when a city finances the construction of a new stadium or arena and strategically plans where, when, and how, it’s likely that positive benefits will accrue. It’s almost like growing a plant. You buy the pot and soil (the stadium or arena), you plant the seed inside of it (the team), you give it sunlight, water, and time (exposure and maturity), and then you watch it grow into a big successful plant (successful stadium/arena and team).

Ultimately, the authors recommend that cities should finance a new stadium or arena for a professional team if they are given the opportunity. Such financing would have a positive economic impact, as well as create tangible and intangible benefits for the city and its residents. Cities get a lot in return for providing their citizens entertainment with a professional sports team, and public financing of new arenas should be considered.
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Getting Involved Early in Your Career: Administration and Service Opportunities as Graduate Students

Bruce Lund, Saori Ishikawa, and Joel Reece
Middle Tennessee State University

Three Ph.D. Candidates in the Department of Health and Human Performance from Middle Tennessee State University wrote this article after attending the 2012 National Association of Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) Leader Development Workshop (LDW) held at Georgia State University. This article serves as an opinion piece written for current and future graduate students interested in entry-level information about administrative work in higher education as well as justifying participation in “service” opportunities. We hope to provide our graduate student peers with an overview of the surface level definitions and concepts of administration in higher education, and how to get involved in service opportunities early on in our careers. Information provided in this article is derived from both the workshop and literature on administration in higher education.

When Dr. Steve Estes, our Department Chair of Health and Human Performance at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), invited us to attend the LDW this summer there was really only one answer, “Yes!” Reasons for attending the conference went well beyond the obvious: the department head and the chair of one of our dissertation committees invited us to attend a conference with him. The opportunity for the three of us to sit-in with department heads, deans, and directors from universities all across the country was hard to pass up.

After arriving at the conference it didn’t take us long to realize that we were the only graduate students attending the conference, but as we went around the table introducing ourselves to the sixteen others in attendance we quickly felt welcomed. It also didn’t take us long to realize how we were “in over our heads” with the wealth of knowledge from various upper-level administrators surrounding us, and the limited knowledge we had regarding service and administration in higher education. But from the very beginning our new mentors did an excellent job breaking down the basics of administration to not only help us understand the issues, but to also include us in discussions.

Heading into the conference we were unprepared with background knowledge in understanding what “administration” in higher education is, and the issues that administrators face. After the first break, we all realized that the three of us felt the same: as graduate students, we are typically not trained to understand much of what goes on behind the scenes in higher education administration, and we are not encouraged to engage in service. Administration is, too often, a phrase that is frequently heard but not fully understood. When we were approached to write an article from the perspective of graduate students attending the LDW we immediately felt that discussing administration is where we needed to start. This article focuses on our perspective on administrative positions such as department chairs and deans, but we recognize that other university administration positions inform our discussions and thoughts as well.

Understanding Administration in Higher Education (With a Special Focus on the Academic Department Chair)

Leadership positions in higher education administration are usually divided into three areas of expertise: (1) academic affairs (academic leadership positions); (2) student affairs; and (3)
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administrative affairs (Sagaria, 1988). A review of the literature on academic administrators points out that the majority begin their careers as faculty members (Passauer, 2004). As discussed during the workshop, administrators are typically experienced in teaching, research, and service. Administrators, particularly department chairs, are usually selected through one of the following three ways: selected from a pool of applicants after a national search, recommended by faculty within their department and then approved by the Academic Dean, or chosen by the administration (usually the Academic Dean) without faculty involvement (Tucker, 1993). The reason for their selection typically stems from a professor’s versatility and reputation as exceptional teachers and/or scholars (Passauer, 2004). It is noteworthy that they are not selected for their leadership skills, and this was one of the teachable moments of the workshop—finding that the criteria for selecting academic leaders has little to do with leadership!

As a consequence, faculty who are selected to the role of department chair are usually unprepared for the job. The roles and responsibilities for administrators in higher education are, in many cases, poorly defined and informally presented, and rarely are chairs provided an opportunity to study and train for the job (Tucker, 1993). Department chairs fulfill almost every administrative role in the modern university. In addition there is usually some specialization of tasks performed at each administrative level. Administrators can have a variety of roles and responsibilities from managing budgets, personnel, and policies to communicating the overall vision, mission, goals, and objectives to the university or departments. A review of the literature illustrates the complexities that exist for the roles and responsibilities in academic administration dating back over 30 years (Roach, 1976; Jennerich, 1981; Singleton, 1987; Green et. al., 1991; Williams, 1991; Carroll & Gmelch, 1992; Tucker, 1993, Pettit, 1999). Because of the many talents required of administrators “…they often begin their administrative position lacking some of the skills and background knowledge needed for effective performance” (Townsend & Bassoppo-Mayo, 1996, p. 3).

As is the case with any individual, both strengths and weaknesses can exist in the portfolio of the new administrator. People skills, though, appear to be important. Department chairs in particular tend to work with more people daily than faculty members, and chairs often represent the entire department—meaning they must be the “face of the franchise.” Success of the department as a whole is often predicated on the relationships with faculty members, staff members, and other administrators both inside and outside of the department. Diverse roles and responsibilities often frustrate department heads because of the lack of time and resources (Tucker, 1993). It is probably most accurate to describe academic administrators as “one of the most important yet most overlooked individuals in the governance of American colleges and universities” (Jennerich, 1981, p. 47).

Department heads can struggle with understanding whom they are serving as they interact frequently with students, faculty, and administrators. In addition, they are often caught between being faculty and being administration (Passauer, 2004). However, one thing is certain—there is no shortage of dull moments while serving as “an extension of upper levels of administration in planning, directing, designing curriculum, and allocating resources with the academic department” (Williams, 1995, p. 164). Tucker summarizes the job of the department chair in the following way: “The chairperson, then, is a manager and a faculty colleague, an advisor and an advisee, a soldier and a captain, a drudge and a boss” (Tucker, 1993, p. 33).

Look for Service Opportunities

The LDW also focused on service. As we are often reminded, there are three areas regularly discussed in the industry of higher education: service, research, and teaching. Most graduate students (particularly at the Ph.D. level) understand the teaching and research aspects of their professional development, but the service area might not be explored as much. The LDW falls
Getting Involved Early in Your Career, continued

directly in the service category and helped the three of us understand how “services” like these happen.

The workshop was appropriately titled, “Leading Strategically: Evaluation, Management, and Decision-Making.” We used the many lessons learned to plan our own careers “strategically” by getting involved with as many “service” opportunities as possible. For example, the three of us were able to “strategically lead” our department’s annual graduate teaching assistant (GTA) workshop for all returning and new GTAs. This was an assignment that both helped us stand out as leaders in our respective specializations and gain necessary experience in administrative and service positions. Once completed, our MTSU faculty mentors can speak with some knowledge about an activity that we led on our campus, and therefore can speak positively about our collegiality and management skills in letters of recommendation. It is noteworthy that many times in our professional careers we get the opportunity to grow in our responsibilities by simply doing one thing—asking how we can help. We suggest that doctoral students seek out mentors or faculty members and ask how to best serve by being active in causes you both deem worthy. Before you know it, you will be fully engaged in acts of “service” that you did not even realize existed when you began your studies. And doing this service can open doors for you that you didn’t know were there.

Where to Go From Here?

As educators, it’s our responsibility to always be looking to the future and to enhance the body of knowledge in our specialized fields, and more importantly in the lives of others. The LDW provided a unique opportunity for the three of us to be the first graduate students to attend as emerging leaders, and to learn from experienced administrators from across the county. Opportunities like these are too few for graduate students, and those that do exist are not seized often enough. Building service into the curricula of higher education doctoral programs should (in our opinion) emphasize leadership opportunities. Whether attending a conference like the NAKHE LDW or having the chance to lead workshops for our peers, these are the kinds of opportunities that truly help us grow in our early career development and stand out as leaders of the next generation in higher education.
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Albert Einstein is alleged to have declared that “I never worry about the future – it comes soon enough.” While the merits of such a “live in the here and now” philosophy are admirable, the reality of administration in higher education is more closely aligned with the well-known adage that “those who fail to plan are planning to fail.” Regardless of whether one is engaged in stay-at-home parenting, business, the military, or higher education, all individuals, corporations, and institutions must actively assess, reflect, and plan in order to be successful in accomplishing the mission and achieving the vision of the organization. In his 1983 book *Academic Strategy*, George Keller asserts that “To think strategically is to look intensely at contemporary history and your institution’s position in it and work out a planning process that actively confronts the historical movement, overcomes it, gets on top of it, or seizes the opportunities latent in it.” In the foreword for Keller’s book, then Carnegie-Mellon University President Richard Cyert asserted that strategic planning is “essential to the continued strength of our colleges and universities.” What was true three decades ago remains true for all of us in higher education today; strategic planning is critically important to the success of our respective department, college, or university.

Strategic planning is more than next month’s calendar or next year’s budget. Instead, it is a process that starts with an organization’s core values, vision, and mission, and then lays out in detail how to accomplish the vision and achieve the mission while maintaining fidelity to what the organization believes itself to be – its core values. While many define strategic planning differently, what is most critically important to remember is that an effective strategic plan is one that is uniquely tailored to an organization’s existing environment. This often has to be done in the face of resistance; Keller contends that strategic planning is anathema to some in higher education, and thus starts his discussion with an attempt to establish clarity by differentiating what strategic planning is not (Table 1) and what it is (Table 2).

While all of Keller’s characteristics of effective strategic planning are important, perhaps the most critical is the idea that it is action oriented, consistently addressing where the organization should most effectively allocate (or reallocate) its resources. This is especially true in today’s austere environment, where dollars are scarce and everyone is competing for the same diminishing pool of funding. The most effective way to posture one’s organization for success is by ensuring a direct and clear link between what you want to accomplish and how those achievements will contribute to the goals of your funding source. In other words, what opportunities exist (and what threats lurk) with regard to contributions you might make to the overall strategic goals of the institution?

To best answer this question and start the strategic planning process in earnest, an S-W-O-T analysis is in order. Reflection upon the organization’s **Strengths**, **Weaknesses**, **Opportunities**, and **Threats** will assist in leveraging those things you do well while addressing and minimizing potential obstacles to achieving your desired end state. It is best to conduct an S-W-O-T analysis in a brainstorming format, with representation from all stakeholders. Increased diversity of participants will expand the breadth of ideas and prevent groupthink, and it will garner much greater ownership of the ultimate plan if all parties have a voice from the outset of the strategic planning process. The S-W-O-T analysis should be documented and updated periodically.

(continued)
Strategic Planning, continued

With the completion of the comprehensive S-W-O-T analysis and appropriate assessment and reflection, strategic goals can be developed. As discussed, many strategic plans are equally effective despite the fact that they have a different emphasis, different timelines, or even different components that make up the plan. Recall that good strategic plans are focused on keeping the respective institution in step with a changing environment; we are all operating in our own, unique institutional environments. From available resources, to accreditation requirements, to the directives of a dean, university president, or board of trustees, we all operate under different authorizations and different constraints. There is no standard template for what a good strategic plan looks like, nor is there any approved solution of a strategic plan. That said, there are generally accepted components of a strategic plan that most institutions will include as they document where they are going and how they plan to get there.

Components of a Strategic Plan

- Mission Statement
- Vision
- Strategic Goals
- Objectives
- Action Plans
- Indicators
- Assessment Design
- Pathway for Change

Table 1. What Strategic Planning Is Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Production of a Blueprint</th>
<th>A Surrender to Market Conditions and Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Set of Platitudes</td>
<td>An Exercise Performed on an Annual Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Personal Vision of a President</td>
<td>A Way of Eliminating Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Collection of Compiled Department Plans</td>
<td>An Attempt to Outwit the Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. What Strategic Planning Is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrated on the Fate of the Institution</th>
<th>Active Rather Than Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused on Keeping the Institution in Step with a Changing Environment</td>
<td>Competitive, Recognizing that (higher education) is Subject to Market Conditions and Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Blend of Economic Analysis, Political Maneuvering, and Psychological Interplay</td>
<td>Action Oriented; Constantly Asks “Where Do We Put Our Attention, Energy, &amp; Resources?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Participatory</td>
<td>Highly Tolerant of Controversy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. S-W-O-T Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>THREATS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
In many cases, the mission and vision for an organization are already written when the strategic planning process begins. Following the S-W-O-T analysis, the next critical step is ensuring shared responsibility for creating arguably the most visible aspect of a strategic plan – the organization’s strategic goals. These goals, which are generally enduring, must directly support the mission and vision, and all stakeholders must have a voice in goal development. In other words, accomplishment of the strategic goals must directly contribute to the institution’s mission statement, and the goals are optimally accepted by all as their own. Likewise, if written well, the objectives are also generally enduring and they are nested under each strategic goal. Objectives are consistently reassessed for applicability and contribution to achievement of the strategic goal. Underneath the objectives are action plans and indicators; these provide specific ideas on how the accomplishment of objectives will be assessed, as well as specific measures of effectiveness that can be evaluated. The results of these assessments yield the necessary information to make decisions on allocation or reallocation of resources, or provide an indication that perhaps the strategic objectives are in need of review based on strategic goals and organizational mission.

Following the definition of strategic planning, of determining what needs to be done before a strategic plan can be written, and having determined what components are appropriate for inclusion in an effective strategic plan, it is useful to lay out the recommended steps in the strategic planning process. Again, recall that there is no exact formula for successful strategic planning, and the reader is encouraged to establish a strategic planning process that is compatible with the realities of the individual institution and its administrative, budgetary, and political environment. That said, the following figure offers one way of sequencing the strategic planning process for efficiency and effectiveness.

The timeline associated with each of these steps is unique to the institution/organization, but as discussed, the strategic goals and objectives should be relatively enduring. As outlined in Step 2, the establishment of milestones is particularly important so that momentum is maintained and the process continues to move forward. This is a critical aspect of the plan, as often times the dynamics of higher education introduce obstacles to change. Visible and enforced milestones will greatly assist in overcoming impediments to change.

One institution that recently completed the strategic planning process is Cornell University. Its document entitled *Cornell University at its Sesquicentennial: A Strategic Plan 2010–2015* is an outstanding example of how our colleagues in higher education can translate their university’s core values, mission and vision into a guiding document that sets the azimuth for five years into the future. However, to illustrate the point that there is no ‘approved solution’ for stra-

(continued)
Strategic Planning, continued

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preamble</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell’s Enduring Commitments</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mission, Core Values, University Aspiration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institution and its Environment</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strategic Challenges, Governance Issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Areas: Objectives and Actions</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Strategies and Metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Organizational Stewardship</td>
<td>Peer Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Financial Resources, Physical Facilities, IT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>Benchmark Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Process, Diversity, Assessment)</td>
<td>Key Priorities and Investment Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic planning, let us compare Cornell’s outstanding plan with another superb strategic plan – that of Purdue University – entitled "New Synergies." While both plans clearly capture the essential elements of a strategic plan, they do so in vastly different ways. Upon a more comprehensive review of Cornell’s Strategic Plan 2010–2015 and Purdue’s New Synergies 2008–2014, the reader will find that both universities tailored their respective plan to address the unique strengths and opportunities each possessed as well as the distinctive weaknesses and threats that each faced.

There is a lot to be said for the philosophy of living for today and not worrying about tomorrow, much like Einstein’s approach. Things seemed to work out pretty well for him. Applied to universities, Derek Bok, Harvard’s president emeritus, once noted humorously that Harvard survived for 300 years without either a strategic plan – or a provost! As an administrator in higher education, however, I’m a bit more skeptical. Even Harvard adapted to the times: if one goes on Harvard’s website today one will find that she now has both a strategic plan and a provost! As resources continue to become more scarce, I intend to continue to worry about the future and plan for it ... strategically plan, that is.

Notes
3Keller, 140–152.
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Leader Development Workshop

The National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education and The Department of Kinesiology and Health Georgia State University

July 10–12, 2013

The 4th NAKHE Leader Development Workshop focuses on providing opportunities for kinesiology faculty – especially those beginning their careers – to discuss leadership in the field by working on common problems with some of kinesiology’s senior administrators. NAKHE invites faculty, administrators, and doctoral students who are interested in moving into leader roles to attend the Workshop.

The format of the Workshop is a Wednesday (10 July) evening social as participants arrive, a full day discussion and activities on Thursday (11 July), and completion of the workshop by noon on Friday, 12 July. This year’s workshop will discuss social identity theory and leadership, assess for leader skills and discuss leader characteristics, and discuss “fit” within an academic unit.

Contact Steve Estes at steven.estes@mtsu.edu for information, or the NAKHE website at www.nakhe.org

NAKHE Foundation Memorial Fund

This fund was started with a large gift to NAKHE through the will of Dean A. Pease. Donations to the NAKHE Foundation Memorial Fund can be forwarded to:

NAKHE c/o Carrie Sampson Moore
Department of Athletics, Physical Education, & Recreation
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Ave
Cambridge, MA 02139
617.253.5004 (office)
clsmoore@mit.edu

Make checks payable to: NAKHE Foundation Memorial Fund.

(continued)
Funding for NAKHE Special Projects

One of the responsibilities of the Foundations Committee is to oversee the spending of all endowed funds. There is interest money available in NAKHE’s endowed funds to be used for special projects to further the goals of NAKHE. These are also projects that would not fall under the operating budget of NAKHE. Requests for special projects should be submitted by July 1st or November 1st of each year to the Chair of the Foundations Committee (FC). The FC, if possible, will make their decisions via e-mail. So there should be a short turnaround in the decision-making process.

Project requests should include:
1. Person(s) submitting request, address, phone, e-mail
2. Title and description of project
3. Itemized cost of project
4. Timeline for completion of project
5. Proposed benefits to NAKHE

___ Request Advance    ___ Request Reimbursement    ___ Other

For 2013 requests, submit your proposal to:
Marilyn Buck
School of Physical Education, Sport and Exercise Science
Health and Physical Activity Building (HP) Room 360
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
mbuck@bsu.edu

Call for Proposals for Convention

STEPS into the Future: Exploring Opportunities and Facing the Challenges of the 21st Century
January 8–12, 2014
Bahia Resort Hotel ~ San Diego, CA

2014 CONGRESS OFFICIAL CALL
PAPERS ~ PROPOSALS ~ ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION LEADERS

Be a part of history by participating with leaders in the field at the NAKHE (hosted), AAH-PERD, ACSM, AIESEP, AKA, NAK collaborative conference. Distinguished delegates from each of these associations are meeting as a Congress—much like the Adelphi Congress conceptualized by William Anderson in 1885 and the 1889 Boston Conference in the Interest of Physical Training
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organized by Mary Hemenway and Amy Morris Homans—to address the most pressing issues in the field of Kinesiology. Congress attendees from all associations will have the opportunity to share ideas in regularly scheduled sessions and participate in conference-wide roundtable discussions as delegates.

Papers for the Proceedings of the 2014 Congress will be included in a peer reviewed online journal. All submissions must follow published guidelines and submitted by August 1, 2013. Details available after May 1, 2013 at www.NAKHE.org.

Proposals to Present Papers in the following strand blocks will be accepted until August 1:

- Administrator Workshop Theme: Exploring Opportunities and Facing Leadership Challenges
- Kinesiology faculty for the 21st Century
- Adapting curricula for the 21st Century
- The Public face of Kinesiology in the 21st Century
- The roles and responsibilities of sport and Kinesiology
- Reaching beyond the walls

Leadership Opportunities exist for those of you who wish to be roundtable discussion chairs who will summarize and report roundtable discussions that will be a valuable part of a post 2014 Congress white paper.

Contact Betty Block at betty.block@tamuc.edu for more information.

Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award

Open Paper Competition for Young Professionals

The National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) would like to invite new professionals, employed for the first time (and for less than 5 years) at an institution of higher education, to participate in a special program at the 2014 conference in San Diego, CA on January 8–12, 2014. The 2014 NAKHE conference marks the 14th year in which the Executive Board of NAKHE has approved an Open Paper Competition to encourage the development of innovative ideas and discussions from our newest members of the profession.

The winner of the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Open Paper Competition will have the opportunity to present the paper at a special session at the 2014 conference. In addition to this unique presentation opportunity, the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar will be awarded a monetary prize and given a free membership in NAKHE for the upcoming year. The 2014 Homan’s Lecturer will serve as the respondent to the 2014 Poindexter Young Scholar.

Submission Guidelines:

Send two electronic copies of the paper, one copy with author information and the other copy with only abstract and manuscript to:

Dr. Glenn Hushman
ghushman@unm.edu

SUBMISSION DEADLINE – August 1, 2014!

If you have any specific questions related to the Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award, please feel free to contact Glenn Hushman (ghushman@unm.edu, 505-277-5248). If
you would like specific conference information, please visit the conference web page at http://www.nakhe.org.

We hope to see you in San Diego, CA in 2014!

Sincerely,

Glenn Hushman
Chair of the NAKHE Awards Committee

2014 NAKHE Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award: Call for Papers

A call for papers is made each spring by the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education. The NAKHE Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award provides an opportunity for the newest members of the higher education profession to present professional papers focusing specifically on interdisciplinary issues facing kinesiology, physical education or general higher education environments.

Topics: Original, unpublished research reports, position papers, philosophical statements, or a summary of the present state of an issue may serve as the basis for scholarly papers.

Selection Criteria:
1. Candidates must be full-time faculty members in their first five years of employment at a college or university setting.
2. Submissions may not have been previously published or presented.
3. Selection of papers is made on the basis of scholarly content, organization, and pertinence to kinesiology, physical education or higher education from an interdisciplinary perspective. The author who receives the NAKHE Hally Beth Poindexter Young Scholar Award is invited to present his/her paper at the 2014 NAKHE conference.
4. The papers will be blind-reviewed by committee.
5. Committee criteria includes; (a) a strong connection to the review of current literature in the field, (b) writing style, (c) originality of idea/concept/style of presentation, (d) practical application potential, and (e) the potential contribution to the field.
6. The body of the paper may not exceed fifteen (15) typed pages, doubled spaced.

Awards:
1. One paper will be selected for presentation at the annual conference
2. A $250.00 award will be presented to the selected author.
3. A one year free membership in NAKHE

Submit Paper Electronically To:
Dr. Glenn Hushman ghushman@unm.edu

Deadline for Submitting Papers:
August 1, 2013 (Acceptance and Notification by October 15, 2013)

Presentation Location:
2014 NAKHE Conference, San Diego, CA

Additional Information:
Dr. Glenn Hushman
Phone: 505-277-5248
Fax: 505-277-6227
E-mail: ghushman@unm.edu

(continued)
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2014 NAKHE Doctoral Student Award

Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize for Doctoral Students

The National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) would like to invite doctoral students to submit poster presentations for the 2014 conference in San Diego, CA on January 8–12, 2014. The conference will provide doctoral students with a wide array of sessions to attend that will have greater meaning as they prepare to enter the higher education employment arena. All doctoral students will be offered the opportunity to participate in a committee-reviewed doctoral student poster presentation session. The poster presentations will be available for viewing at the conference. A Review Committee will select one doctoral student poster to receive the Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize, and the presenter will be awarded a monetary prize and a free membership in NAKHE for the coming year. The Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Prize will be awarded at a special reception following the Delphine Hanna Lecture.

In addition to this session, we hope there will be time for doctoral students and faculty members to meet together in a less formal setting to discuss general concepts that pertain to higher education environments. Our hope is to establish a connection between similar doctoral programs and establish a mechanism for communication between students with similar or supportive research directions. The structure and philosophical direction of NAKHE offers a positive interdisciplinary theme that encourages sharing within and across specialty areas; and welcomes new ideas and insights from differing perspectives. There will be numerous social opportunities for doctoral students to interact with NAKHE members.

If you have any specific questions related to doctoral student involvement, please feel free to contact Glenn Hushman (ghushman@unm.edu, 505-277-5248). If you would like specific conference information, please visit the conference web page at http://www.nakpehe.org.

We hope to see you in San Diego, CA in 2014!

Sincerely,

Glenn Hushman
Chair of the NAKHE Awards Committee

2014 NAKHE Joanna Davenport Doctoral Student Poster Session: Call for Posters

The NAKHE Joanna Davenport Doctoral Student Poster Session provides an opportunity for entry-level members of the higher education profession to present posters focusing specifically on physical education.

Topics: Original, unpublished research (current or recently completed) poster presentations and reports.

Selection Criteria:
1. Candidates must be current doctoral students, or have completed their degree after January 1, 2013.
2. Selection of posters for inclusion in the poster session will be made on submitted propos-
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als, and is made on the basis of scholarly content, organization, and pertinence to the field of physical education, kinesiology or higher education.

3. Once a proposal has been selected for inclusion in the poster session, the poster should be organized within the constraints of a $2' \times 4'$ area.

4. Poster presenters will have approximately 30 minutes prior to viewing to set their posters in the appropriate room.

5. The posters will be displayed for at least 1 hour prior to the Delphine Hanna Reception. During this time, a committee will review the posters and select one poster to receive the award.

6. All poster presenters must be present with their posters in the viewing area during the reception. The Joanna Davenport Poster Presentation Award will be presented during the reception.

Awards:
1. A maximum of twelve (12) poster proposals will be selected for presentation at the annual conference.

2. One $250.00 award will be presented during the Delphine Hanna Reception to the selected poster presenter.

3. The selected presenter will also receive one year free membership in NAKHE (including Quest and The Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education subscriptions).

Format your proposal using MS Word and submit via email to:
Dr. Glenn Hushman   ghushman@unm.edu

Deadline for Submitting Proposals:
August 1, 2013 (Acceptance and Notification by October 15, 2013)

Presentation Location:
January 2014 NAKHE Conference, San Diego, CA

Format for Davenport Poster Session Proposals/Presentations

PROPOSAL: ______________________________________________________________

Poster Title: ______________________________________________________________

Presenter(s): _____________________________________________________________

Institution: _______________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________

Doctoral Advisor: ___________________________________________________________

Advisor’s Phone Number: ____________________________________________________

Advisor’s E-mail: ____________________________________________________________

Presenter(s)’s Address: _____________________________________________________

Presenter(s)’s Phone Number: _______________________________________________

Presenter(s)’s E-mail: _______________________________________________________

Please send an electronic copy of this proposal form with a 250 word abstract describing the focus of your presentation by August 1, 2013:
Dr. Glenn Hushman   ghushman@unm.edu

(continued)
The National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education (NAKHE) would like to invite nominations of individuals for the Distinguished Scholar, Distinguished Administrator and Distinguished Service Awards for consideration for the 2014 NAKHE conference in San Diego, CA. These prestigious awards are given each year at the NAKHE conference to honor and celebrate individuals that have dedicated their professional lives to the disciplines of Kinesiology, Physical Education and Higher Education.

Please review the requirements accompanying this invitation. The simple requirement to nominate an individual for an award is to e-mail Glenn Hushman (ghushman@unm.edu) and provide the nominee’s full name, contact information and the identified award (scholar, administration or service).

**DEADLINE for nominations is August 1, 2013.**

If you have any specific questions related to the Distinguished Awards process, please feel free to contact Glenn Hushman (ghushman@unm.edu, 505-277-5248). If you would like specific conference information, please visit the conference web page at http://www.nakpehe.org.

We hope to see you in San Diego, CA in 2014!

Sincerely,

Glenn Hushman
Chair of the NAKHE Awards Committee

**2014 NAKHE Distinguished Service, Scholar and Administrator Awards: Descriptions and Requirements**

**NAKHE – DISTINGUISHED ADMINISTRATOR AWARD**

The Distinguished Administrator Award shall be awarded to a person who through application of administrative/managerial skills has made significant contributions to the profession and or related fields, both within and beyond the higher education community, and has been a contributing member of NAKHE continuously for at least five years. Qualified nominees shall have achieved at least one of the following criteria with distinction:

1. Successful experience as an administrator within a program of kinesiology or physical education in higher education, in at least one of the following categories:
   a. Dean or Assistant/Associate Dean of a school or college in which kinesiology or physical education is a unit
   b. Chairperson of a kinesiology or physical education department in a college or university
2. Advancement of the goals and ideals of the profession through the application of managerial skills within other groups/organizations.
   a. Executive director/president/program leader for a kinesiology or physical education discipline-related organization/conference
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b. Director of a regional /national/international physical education project/activity
c. Dissemination (publication, presentation, teaching) of scholarly/academic innovations concerning physical education administration which has impacted physical education nationally
d. Leadership in kinesiology or physical education as a member of a governing body
e. Record of influence outside the profession of higher education which has served physical education as a discipline beyond the institution

NAKHE – DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

The Distinguished Service Award shall be awarded to a person who:

1. Has been a member of NAKHE continuously for at least ten years.
2. Has given outstanding service to NAKHE as evidenced by achievement in at least five of the following categories:
   a. Officer of the corporation.
   b. Member of the Board of Directors.
   c. Chair of a committee.
   d. Member of committee(s) for at least two years.
   e. Attendee at annual conference(s).
   f. Speaker at annual conference(s).
   g. Invited lecturer: Amy Morris Homans, Dudley Allen Sargent, or Delphine Hanna.
   h. Workshop leader.
   i. Contributor to NAKHE publications.

NAKHE – DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR AWARD

The Distinguished Scholar Award shall be awarded to a person who has made a significant contribution to kinesiology and physical education in higher education through scholarly pursuits within a multi-disciplinary perspective and has been a contributing member of NAKHE continuously for at least five years. Nominees will be judged on their contributions by showing distinction in at least one area with contributions in two or more:

1. Author of a book(s)
2. Author of articles in professional or lay periodicals
3. Editor of book(s) or monographs
4. Researcher who develops, executes and reports significant research
5. Lecturer at professional meetings
6. Other scholarly areas not listed above
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Authors Sought

We’re always looking for quality articles for the Leadership, Current Issues, Best Practice, Research, New Professionals, International Columns, Scholarly Publications, Public Affairs, Doctoral Student Submissions and Administration. Please consider submitting an article to one of these columns or encourage your colleagues to do so. Contact the appropriate Associate Editor or the Editor directly with your submission or any questions. Article wishing to be peer reviewed must make that request to the editor at the time of submission.

Chronicle Deadlines

Deadlines for The Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy to Editor</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All material submitted to CKHE must be double spaced, and regular articles should not exceed 8 pages in length.

Chronicle Editor

Dr. Britton Johnson
Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
4525 Downs Dr. (214 F Looney Complex)
Missouri Western State University
St. Joseph, MO 64507
Fax: (816) 271-5940
Phone: (816) 271-4309
E-mail: bjohnson35@missouriwestern.edu

Associate Editors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Associate Editor</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in KPE Higher Education</td>
<td>Steve Estes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steven.Estes@mtsu.edu">Steven.Estes@mtsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Issues</td>
<td>Sam Hodge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hodge.14@osu.edu">Hodge.14@osu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice in Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Mel Finkenberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu">mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Digest</td>
<td>Bob Pangrazi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pangrazi1@msn.com">pangrazi1@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New KPE Professionals</td>
<td>Camille O’Bryant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cobryant@calpoly.edu">cobryant@calpoly.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Publications</td>
<td>Deborah Buswell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buswelld@sfasu.edu">buswelld@sfasu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student Submissions</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Memoriam</td>
<td>Deborah Buswell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buswelld@sfasu.edu">buswelld@sfasu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Announcements, continued

To Join NAKHE or Renew Your Membership

NAKHE membership entitles you to three issues of *Quest*, one of which features the *Academy Papers*, and two issues of the *Chronicle of Kinesiology in Higher Education* per year, and to member rates for the annual conference. Please complete this form and return it to the address listed.**

*Or apply online at [www.nakhe.org](http://www.nakhe.org)*

What are your special interests?

Check no more than three.

**Rank**

- Adapted
- Administration
- Anatomical Kinesiology
- Anthropology of Play
- Athletic Training
- Basic Instruction
- Biomechanics
- Coaching
- Comparative/International
- Curriculum
- Sport Management
- Dance
- History
- Measurement & Evaluation
- Motor Development
- Motor Learning/Control
- Pedagogy
- Philosophy
- Physiology of Exercise
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Other______________

**Institution**

- 4 yr. college/university
- Jr./community college

Name __________________________________________________________________________

Address  __________________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip, Country ____________________________________________________________

- U.S. Faculty $80
- International Faculty $80 (includes mailing)
- Emeritus (all publications) $45
- Emeritus (*Chronicle only*) $15
- Graduate Students $30
- Concurrent AAKPE membership $30
- Sustaining Member $85
- Tax deductible contribution to NAKHE $_________________

**Mail checks, payable to NAKHE, and this form to:**

NAKHE c/o Carrie Sampson Moore
Department of Athletics, Physical Education, & Recreation
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Ave
Cambridge, MA 02139
617.253.5004 (office)
clsmoore@mit.edu

*(Canadian and other foreign members must use a money order or check imprinted “U.S. Funds.”)*
Announcements, continued

NAKHE Leadership Roster, 2013–2014

President: Camille O’Bryant, California Polytechnic State University cobryant@calpoly.edu
President-Elect: Steve Estes, Middle Tennessee State University Steven.Estes@mtsu.edu
Past President: Jimmy Ishee, Texas Woman’s University jishee@twu.edu
Vice President: Betty Block, Texas A&M – Commerce Betty.Block@tamuc.edu
Vice President-Elect: Mark Urtel, IUPUI murtell1@iupui.edu
Executive Director: Carrie Sampson Moore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology clsmoore@mit.edu
Secretary: Gloria Napper-Owen, University of New Mexico napperow@unm.edu
Parliamentarian: Mel Finkenberg, Stephen F Austin University mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu
Necrologist: Anne Stewart, emlean@gmail.com
Archivist: Pam Brown, University of North Carolina-Greensboro plkocher@uncg.edu
CKHE Editor: Britton Johnson, bjohnson35@missouriwestern.edu
Quest Editor: Michael Metzler mmetzler@gsu.edu

Associate Editors
Leadership in KPE Higher Education: Steve Estes, Steven.Estes@mtsu.edu
Current Issues: Samuel Hodge, hodge.14@osu.edu
Best Practice in Teaching and Learning: Mel Finkenberg, mfinkenberg@sfasu.edu
Research Digest: Bob Pangrazi, pangrazi1@msn.com
New KPE Professionals: Camille O’Bryant, cobryant@calpoly.edu
International: Vacant
Scholarly Publications: Vacant
Public Affairs: Vacant
Administration: Vacant
In Memoriam: Deborah Buswell, buswelld@sfasu.edu

Committee Chairs:
Bylaws: Richard Oates, North Georgia College & State University roates@northgeorgia.edu
Foundations: Marilyn Buck, Ball State mbuck@bsu.edu
Future Directions: John Charles, William and Mary jmchar@wm.edu
Member Services: Leah Holland Fiorentino, North Carolina – Pembroke leah.fiorentino@uncp.edu
Publications: Shane Frehlich, California State – Northridge shane.g.frehlich@csun.edu

Member Services Sub-Committee Chairs:
Awards: Glenn Hushman, University of New Mexico ghushman@unm.edu
Membership: Kacey DiGiacinto, Elizabeth City State University kldigiacinto@mail.ecsu.edu
Nominations & Elections: David Claxton, Western Carolina University Claxton@wcu.edu
Public Affairs: Gwendolyn Weatherford, Texas A&M – Commerce gwen.weatherford@tamuc.edu
Social Justice & Cultural Diversity: Samuel Hodge, Ohio State University hodge.14@osu.edu
Technology: Mike Kernodle, Appalachian State University kernodlemw@appstate.edu

(continued)
Nominations for NAKHE

Nominations for Vice-President Elect and President Elect

This is a call for nominations for the positions of Vice-President Elect and President Elect. If you have an interest in serving as president or vice-president of NAKHE, or if you know of one of our members who has the skills to be an effective leader of our Association, please let the elections and nominations committee know about that.

Why, you might ask, would you want to nominate yourself for one of these positions, or if nominated would you want to serve? Two reasons immediately come to mind. The first is purely self-serving. Serving in a prominent leadership role in one of the most historic organizations in kinesiology and physical education puts you in an elite group of distinguished leaders in our field. Your membership among this elite group brings you recognition among the colleagues at your institution. If you are looking for a line in your vita that demonstrates that you are a leader in our field, this is your chance. Tenure and promotion decisions often include how you are recognized by your colleagues within your discipline across the nation. So if you are up for tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, or are looking to relocate, for purely selfish reasons, please consider running for one of these offices.

The second reason is far more altruistic. Our association needs good leadership. Yes, this will take additional time out of your busy schedule. And yes, you will probably have to come to the NAKHE meeting a day earlier than you usually come. But ours is an important, and again I’ll say, historic organization. It has only existed this long because dedicated professionals have been willing to give of their time and effort to make it work. If you’ve been an active member of NAKHE but have never been a leader in NAKHE, now is the time. You owe it to our profession.

If you would consider running for one of these offices, or if you know someone who would make a good leader in NAKHE, please communicate that information to David Claxton, Chair of the Elections and Nominations committee of NAKHE at Claxton@wcu.edu.

Job Notice

Web Postings

Submit your job openings for posting at a NAKHE Webpage and for e-mailing to over 600 professionals in the field. The Website OPERA is updated weekly and receives nearly 600 hits per week. The annual registration fee for hiring departments is $150. For details, please visit http://www.nakhe.org/OPERA/Index.html

Published by Routledge on behalf of the National Association for Kinesiology in Higher Education.